

January 11, 1999

Theodore J. Kaczynski
04475-046
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

Thank you for your letters of January 1 and 6, which arrived today. I too have fallen behind in our correspondence due to the post-holiday workload.

Much that is discussed in your letter of December 23 is now dated, since it involves the contract, which I have sent to you. As for Ulveman's pictures, we might use the breeze-way/curing-place, but my impression is that this may also be used to good advantage in your Autobiography. I would like to focus on pictures that illustrate the text in a direct manner. I have listed the sort of images I am after, and will do my best to acquire them (Dec. 29, P.1, ¶ 4).

I have already commented on the damage to envelopes in which you have sent letters to me in a previous letter. The Mello issue, which is discussed in the above and your letter of December 27, is now moot, for better or worse. As for your letter of the 28th, I do hope that Bonnie gave you a copy of the email notice I sent to you via him regarding the deadline for Mello's book (end of paragraph 2, p. 2). A publisher's deadlines are strict in two senses: real and practical. I do of course have a real deadline. But experience has taught me that it is best not to share this with the author. This is the reason for the practical deadline, which means that the author will cease to send in corrections. Unfortunately, many authors change their books *ad nauseum*, or at least that is the editor's experience. So, the 7th was a practical deadline. I would like to reiterate that I was disturbed to find out how much trouble this was giving you, and called Bonnie with a message when the above letters arrived. I hope you will accept my sincere apology.

Now for your letters of January 1 and 6. You have nothing to apologize for regarding the salutation you tossed my way during our conversation on Christmas Eve. I paused because I was not sure whether wishing you a Merry Christmas was appropriate, since the likelihood of your doing so in your present digs seemed small. I did work through the holidays, but only because my life has been usurped by things that must be dealt with in that particular space, where I have access to telephones, facsimile, Internet, copy machines, and the like. But I was raised Episcopalian, and before my parents died (my mother in 1986 and my stepfather in 1992 respectively) I celebrated with the rest of them, although I did skip the holiday for

ideological/personal reasons on occasion (once for a pagan winter-solstice shindig). In the main, I enjoy Christmas. People behave with more kindness and consideration. I described our conversation to a very close friend as the best Christmas present I received this year. So, there is no need to apologize. In addition, my biological father is indeed Jewish. So, you were half-correct to suspect that you'd made a cultural faux pas, but that sort of thing concerns me not at all.

I had noticed the irritable tone in your most recent letters. I know that you are under considerable pressure, and I did not take it overly amiss. I thank you for the apology.

On a similar note, my apology for listening to Gary was necessary. I wanted you to know what had prompted me vis-à-vis the requested edits of the "mail" issue with your mother and the Tarmichael affair. I agree that your apology to the reader would benefit from the deletion you have suggested. I will strike: "it's no harsher than... in any case." As for the paragraph that I wanted you to add, it is an amusing anecdote, which made me laugh in a knowing way. It makes the reader feel as though s/he is an insider, and will therefore engender sympathy. I know you are not necessarily concerned with engendering sympathy. I only suggest it for the rhetorical affect it exercises on this section. We can relegate it to a footnote, or you can delete it. Please do not include it if my argument is not sufficiently compelling. By doing me a favor, you would be disfavoring yourself.

I think Ulveman would be fine for English-language publications. An editor will put things right. As for Gary, I know your position.

P.3, ¶ 2: I am looking forward to seeing Derrick Jensen's manuscript, and any other writers you respect. Of course, I will only be *looking* at the work, and can guarantee nothing more than a cordial response to any queries I receive.

P. 4, ¶ 2: Alston Chase has not been anywhere on my daily horizon, and if he contacts me for some reason, I will be kindly careful. I treat all inquiries in this manner, except when I feel that someone is behaving in an underhanded manner (Pacific Street Films), which I generally deal with by applying a balm, as it were, of stinging nettles. People do seem to feed you a lot of cock and bull in the service of their personal agenda. It can give rise to bad information when, for example, you ask correspondents to check up on each other. Not everyone is a stone wall to strangers, and behavior can usually be interpreted opportunistically by an informant who thinks a particular answer is sought. The situation is not dissimilar to the notion of media planting, as it is discussed in *Truth versus Lies*. People often respond in the manner they think will be most pleasing or readily accepted. So, if you say, "I suspect Chase is a liar," the chances are good that your informant will find reason to substantiate the remark. Similarly, if you preface an inquiry with: "I have not found the slightest reason to doubt Mr. Friedlander's honesty," it is likely that the investigator will come to the same conclusion. The psychologically complex bias of the interpreter is more readily understood to be the vehicle of both truth and lies. The "truth" of motivation in the subject is always understandable through the aegis of an old-fashioned apology

(i.e., explanation) that may or may not be acceptable to the offended party. Truth must be predicated by intent, which is infinitely easier to finger. I do understand that your current situation necessitates this course of action. And I apologize for rambling at such length.

Bonnie has helped me to better understand your goals regarding the publication of *Truth versus Lies*. You will be happy to hear that he reported your position with such accuracy that there was little in pages four and five that was new to me. The above paragraph comes in handy right now, because I would like to stress to you that profit is not my *sine qua non* for publishing your book. There will be profit if I do my job correctly, which will be put to good use in the realization of my goals as a publisher. But the "truth" regarding the *60 Minutes* interview also has much to do with my belief that Americans, and the world, will cease to view the Unabomber (whom they presume to be you) as the "sick" person portrayed by the media. (Bonnie has informed me of your position regarding *60 Minutes*, which I bear in mind always.) To continue, I do not pretend that you will be accepted with the credulity granted to the dubious Mr. Ralph Nader. You will be perceived as an immoral ideologue. Not a bad outcome considering the warped view the public now holds dearly as the "truth." People will indeed be forced to listen to you. In the process, they will discover a rational, likeable person, which will create strongly contrasting relief against the current backdrop so deftly patched together in the prosecution's Sentencing Memorandum, and the media: the canted portrait of a murderous schizophrenic with an axe to grind. The audience will have to recognize *both* the "good" parts and the "bad."

This would be in everybody's interest, although admittedly not necessarily in your *own* best interest. But you can help change things. There are proselytes out there. They are not exclusively radicals, disenchanted leftists, right-wingers etc. The people of the world are on the verge of being in radical danger of annihilation at their own hands. They know this in a trance-like way. I am not trying to suggest that a televised interview would initiate a mass movement. But it might be an important catalyst for change. You would need to adjust your perception of the ideal audience for your book, and the goals associated with the publications you generate in the future, which thus far has been unattractive, if not anathema, to you.

I had a drink with Peter Silantiev last night, a counselor at the Embassy of the Russian Federation, and former bureau chief of *Novosti*, the state information agency. We ostensibly met to discuss some of the Soviet-era and post-Perestroika books that I would like to publish. When I told him about Mike's book, his eyes lit up. "The Unabomber," he said, "is a very great man." He then went on to qualify his pronouncement by disapproving of the murders. I asked him how terribly different these murders were from those committed by the likes of Mao, Stalin, Pinochet, Mobuto. This of course started a very involved discussion regarding large and small political movements (he brought up Bader-Meinhof). We both agreed that there are differences between the acts of the above heads of state and those of the Unabomber. My question had been rhetorical. But his position shifted somewhat, which was the intended outcome.

All this argumentation is perhaps to no end. The above paragraphs were written because I believe that public discourse is a powerful tool (of course a publisher *would* think that). I am sticking to

the schedule regarding *60 Minutes*, and will not contact them until the end of the month. I do not think they will do a segment on Michael's book without an accompanying interview with you. The program is personality-driven. I am not certain that they are even interested in Mike, or his argument about the trial. They are interested in his book as it relates to you. That is why they want to interview you. Bonnie was supposed to suggest that you agree to answer three or four pre-scripted questions, which you would address during a videotaped session with Mike Wallace. When I asked him your response to the above suggestion, he told me that there had not been enough time to discuss everything. This format would give you ample opportunity to determine whether or not they are going to portray you in a positive light. I believe that Bonnie agrees with me. If you felt comfortable afterwards, you could then consider a looser question and answer format. I have had no indication from the people at *60 Minutes* that they would agree to the above format. I did query them, but received flim-flam for what was understood to be idle conjecture on my part. I do not blame them. My query fell within the realm of idle conjecture, since I had already told them that you would not give them an interview. I was fishing without a hook.

Which brings us, *sans segue* (French and Italian), to language in a more or less general way. A Pakistani friend has waxed about Urdu as the most poetic language. I know a few people from the PPK part of Turkey (they are of course Kurdish). Turkish must be a terrific language, with its mish-mash of influences that have collided since time immemorial in the cultural riptide that is today's Istanbul. You may have heard of Martin Buber's book titled: *Ich und Du*. That is the extent of my Turkish: *Ben* and *Sen* (or maybe it's the other way around...). I guess Ramzi Yousef speaks Farsi. I am only truly fluent in Swedish. I lived there with exgirlfriend over a period of three years. I have what can only be called *limited* proficiency in several other languages. To be more specific, I can decipher Icelandic*, Norwegian*, Danish, German*, Dutch, and French*, mostly with the aid of a dictionary. My French is terrible, much of it fallen into disrepair. My German and Norwegian are *in media res* to becoming fluent. But both are somewhat rusty for lack of practice. The asterisks indicate languages I have professionally translated into English. I studied French in high school, and German in college, and picked up the rest, like so many burrs during a walk through autumnal leas, without formal training. So, I regret to inform you that I am not much of an expert. Whatever linguistic aptitude I may have comes by way of music: I began playing classical guitar as a six-year-old, and continue to ply at the art. As for your professed difficulty speaking Spanish, put your musical talents to work, think of the words as sonic units, sentences as so many melodies. Mockingbirds with different cords would make the best polyglots!

Regarding your envy, I'd give anything to have the capacity for abstraction and exactitude exhibited by both your latter-day writings, and your earlier years as a mathematician.

P. 7, ¶ 2: I look very much forward to seeing the manuscript of the manifesto that was received by the *New York Times*. As for the letters, if they merit publication, I will gladly consider them. I imagine that you have received some fairly interesting correspondence regarding *Industrial Society and Its Future*. I would most like to see a foreword written by you, but I have the

impression (from you) that this is a request that will not/cannot be accommodated. I am open to suggestions. And the idea of a printed symposium *is* an interesting proposal.

P. 7, ¶ 4: I was somewhat excited to have you on the telephone, and therefore neglected to say that I had received a copy of the first batch of comments on the contract. As you will see in connection with the revised contract, and the enclosed list of letters received, I have received all communications regarding the contract. Indeed, there is only one question mark regarding received correspondence, which I have indicated. There is only a very slight chance that I have misplaced this letter, since I am very careful and keep all material associated with you in a locked file. I am willing to consider the eventuality that I am to blame, but I would be surprised.

P. 9, ¶ 3: As I said earlier, public opinion does matter. Any lies about you should be quashed. It matters in the larger world of media and public opinion, since both of these entities are required to effect a change in modern society. Whether we mutually understand that a changed *society* would be desirable, is another matter entirely. What I would like to see vis-à-vis the revision of the public understanding of the Unabomber can be likened to the proper functioning of an organism. Synergy is necessary. Nothing is superfluous. It may be that Chris Waits is only the appendix of the organism, but if that is the case it looks about to rupture, spewing toxins everywhere. Thus, my opinion is that this book should be left to die a natural death — and hopefully it will not prove toxic. The national press will pick up anything you write for a Montana paper. If you want to write a rebuttal, I should be able to make the necessary arrangements. Regarding the *Missoulian* article, my opinion is the same. But I will help if you decide to write something.

Greenberg and Mike have mentioned William Booth. I know nothing about him, but will see what I can dig up. National *news-oriented* magazines will be able to cover the 2255 on very short notice, so both newspapers and news magazines will be the order of the day. Your friend might have some trouble getting articles published in the national papers. If you trust her implicitly, and give her quotes to which no one else has access, she may stand a chance. The only danger is that an editor could make considerable changes if it was not up to par with the house style. She might not like that very much, and it wouldn't serve your purposes. Doing an interview with her might not be a bad idea, since the question and answer format is relatively easy to master. I could help edit it.

P. 11, PPS: None of the certified envelopes have been damaged, although two have arrived unsealed. (Large manila: Z 438 937 225; regular env. #29: Z 403 256 236.)

Jan. 6, 1999 letter; P. 1, ¶ 2: I look forward to seeing anything you write in the future, and will help you in any way that I can with articles you would like to publish. You have only to decide how you would like to proceed. I am not worried about competing material, *per se*, but I would appreciate the opportunity to review articles that are forthcoming so that I know what to expect from people who might call me asking about them.

I have a grave understanding of the autonomy issue to which your current situation gives rise. I have no interest in encroaching on your autonomy, or what is left of it, and that's all there is to it. Perhaps this is why our relations have thus far been so mutually agreeable and beneficent. We have maintained our individual integrity while working in concert on this project. I hope this continues to be the case, and that an atmosphere of uncompelled cooperation, collaboration and tolerance prevail.

I have not changed the status of my non-communication with your family members. It has occurred to me that they may have useful pictures, perhaps even of your property in Florence Gulch. You let me know when, or if, the time comes to make inquiries.

Although I have never met him, I suspect that Regnery is a scoundrel, and I have wondered from time to time why you contacted him. Was it on the basis of Graysmith's book?

All best wishes until the next letter.

Yrs,

Beau.

encl: correspondence check list.